# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/843,548 | 04/26/2001 | Koichi Nakamura | JP919990227US1 (590.049) | 9240 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 35195 | 7590 | 07/05/2005 |

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES
409 BROAD STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15143

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| PHILLIPS, HASSAN A |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2151 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 May 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.     2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15,17 and 18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15,17 and 18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.  This action is in response to the request for reconsideration, amendments, and remarks, filed on May 10, 2005.

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

2.  A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 10, 2005 has been entered.

### *Claim Objections*

3.  Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: Examiner feels the word "use" in the 3rd line of the claim should be spelled "user". Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

4.  After consideration of the amendments made to claim 10, Examiner has withdrawn the rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

### *Response to Arguments*

5.  Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16, have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

6.  The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7.  Claims 1-5, 8, 13, 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly

anticipated by Nakayama et al., (hereinafter Nakayama), U.S. Patent 5,872,924.

8.  In considering claim 1, Nakayama teaches a computer system comprising: a

plurality of user systems connected to each other, each user system being adapted to

display a work area on a display screen, alternatively a plurality of user systems

connected to each other through a computer network (Fig. 1), wherein each of the user

systems includes: a collaboration work controller having a user management table

(142) for registering a node identification code (147) given for each of the user systems

and an owner identifier (146) related to the node identification code, and an object

management table (142) for registering object information (143, 145) related to the node

identification code, (col. 7, lines 46-64); and, an obtainer for obtaining, based on an

event entry for an object, the node identification code related to the object by referring to

the object management table, obtaining the owner identifier related to the obtained node

identification code by referring to the user management table, and displaying an owner

identifier on the screen in a manner that the obtained owner identifier can be

discriminated from owner identifiers of other objects, (col. 7, lines 27-42).

9.  In considering claim 2, Nakayama further teaches the event entry being a

drawing operation carried out by the owner of the object, alternatively a selection

operation carried out by a user other than the owner of the object, (col. 10, line 54,

through col. 11, line 45).

10. In considering claim 3, Nakayama teaches the owner identifier being

displayed at one of starting and finishing points of the object, and at other points of the

object by means of superposition, (col. 7, lines 36-42, Fig. 6).

11. In considering claim 4, Nakayama teaches an editor for performing an editing

operation including copying, movement, deletion and others for the obtained object,

(col. 5, line 50, through col. 6, line 16).

12. In considering claim 5, Nakayama teaches registering security level

information (148) related to the node identification code, and the editing operation being

permitted within a range compliant with the security level information, (col. 7, line 65,

through col. 8, line 20).


13. In considering claims 8 and 15, Nakayama teaches a method and computer

readable storage medium recording program codes used for identifying the owner of a

collaboration work object, the object having been created based on collaboration work

by using a computer system having a plurality of user systems connected to each other,

alternatively a plurality of user systems connected to each other through a computer

network, comprising the steps of: causing one of the user systems to store object data

contained in collaboration work data received from the other user systems in an object

management table (142) by relating the data to a node identification code (147) of each

of the other user systems, and to display an object thereof on a screen of the user

system, (col. 7, lines 46-64); obtaining the node identification code by referring to the

object management table when the object displayed on the screen is selected, (col. 7,

lines 46-64); and obtaining an owner identifier (146) related to the obtained node

identification code by referring to the user management table of the user system, (col. 7,

lines 46-64); and displaying the owner identifier on the screen, by means of

superposition at one of starting and finishing points of the selected object, and other

points of the selected object, (col. 7, lines 36-42, Fig. 6).


14. In considering claim 13, Nakayama further teaches transmitting, when any

one of the plurality of user systems starts collaboration work, user information

containing a node identification code thereof and an owner identifier to the other user

systems, (col. 9, line 54, through col. 11, line 18); and causing the other user systems

having received the user information to store in each user management table, (col. 7,

lines 46-64).

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 6, 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Nakayama in view of Itakura, U.S. patent 6,639,608.

17. In considering claims 6 and 14, although the disclosed system of Nakayama

shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show: deleting

or eliminating the display of the owner identifier according to a timer operation.

Nevertheless, Itakura teaches a system for displaying images received from a

network comprising: deleting an image received over the network according to a timer

operation, (col. 10, lines 53-67, col. 11, lines 1-5).

Thus given the teachings of Itakura, it would have been apparent to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Nakayama to show deleting or

eliminating the display of the owner identifier on the screen of the user system

according to a timer operation. This would have made a user effectively aware of who

owns the object for a specified period of time, Nakayama, col. 1, lines 37-63, Itakura,

col. 2, lines 54-67, and col. 3, lines 1-15.


18. Claims 7, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nakayama in view of Simonoff, U.S. patent 6,463,460.


19. In considering claim 7, Nakayama further teaches a session controller for

controlling a session for each collaboration work (col. 4, lines 14-27), wherein the

session controller includes a management table (142) for registering a user

identification code (146) for identifying a user taking part in the session, and a node

identification code (147) of the user system used by the user, and the session controller

refers to the management table, and transmits data to the other user systems taking

part in the session regarding all sessions registering the user identification code

contained in data sent from the user, (col. 7, lines 46-64, col. 4, lines 14-27).

Although the disclosed system of Nakayama shows substantial features of the

claimed invention, it fails to expressly show: code for identifying the session.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Simonoff teaches an interactive

communication system for collaboration between users comprising: inherent use of a

code for identifying a collaboration session, (col. 24, line 53, through col. 25 line 2).

Thus given the teachings of Simonoff, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Nakayama to show registering a session identification code for identifying a session in the management table. This would have provided an efficient means for allowing users to join a session already in progress, Simonoff col. 24, line 53, through col. 25 line 2. This also would have advantageously provided a means for storing session for later playback and/or critiquing, Simonoff, col. 25, lines 25-37.

20. In considering claims 17 and 18, Nakayama teaches a method and computer readable storage medium recording program codes used for identifying a collaboration work object, the object having been created based on collaboration work by using a computer system having a plurality of user systems connected to each other, alternatively a plurality of user systems connected to each other through a computer network, comprising the steps of: causing one of the user systems to store object data contained in collaboration work data received from the other user systems in an object management table (142) by relating the data to a node identification code (147) of each of the other user systems, (col. 7, lines 46-64); displaying on the screen of said user system the collaboration work objects created during a collaboration work session, (col. 11, line 56, through col. 12, line 63); displaying on the screen of said user system an identification of the owners of collaboration work objects created during said collaboration work session, (col. 7, lines 36-42); and obtaining the node identification code given for a user system by referring to a user management table (142) of the user

system and the work objects related to the obtained node identification code by referring

to the object management table, (col. 7, lines 46-64).

Although the disclosed system of Nakayama shows substantial features of the

claimed invention, it fails to expressly show: displaying a particular owner's objects by

selecting the owner.

Nevertheless, displaying objects by means of selection was well known in the art

at the time of the present invention. This is exemplified in the teachings of Simonoff.

Simonoff teaches selecting a resource list in order to display a variety of objects created

for use in collaboration work sessions, (col. 15, line 55, through col. 16, line 2).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the

teachings of Nakayama to show displaying a particular owner's objects by selecting the

owner. This would have provided an efficient means for selecting objects, owned by

other users, to be displayed during a collaboration session, Simonoff, col. 15, lines 55-

61.


21. In considering claim 10, Nakayama teaches the owner identifier being

displayed at one of starting and finishing points of the object, and at other points of the

object by means of superposition, (col. 7, lines 36-42, Fig. 6).


22. In considering claim 11, Nakayama teaches performing an editing operation

including copying, movement, deletion and others for the obtained object, (col. 5, line

50, through col. 6, line 16).

23. In considering claim 12, Nakayama teaches registering security level information (148) related to the node identification code, and the editing operation being permitted within a range compliant with the security level information, (col. 7, line 65, through col. 8, line 20).

## *Conclusion*

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HP/
6/29/05

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER